DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 191 24 TE 499 949

By-Kane, Frank; Baker, Gary G.

Minorities and Prejudice in America. Teacher and Student Manuals.

Amherst Coll., Mass.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Report No-CRP-H-168
Bureau No-BR-5-1071
Pub Date 66
Contract-OEC-5-10-158
Note-56p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.90
Descriptors-*American History, American Indians, Chinese Americans, *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Ethnic Groups, *History Instruction, Instructional Materials, Japanese Americans, Jews, Majority Attitudes, *Minority Groups, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Racial Discrimination, Religious Discrimination, Secondary Education, Social Discrimination, Social Sciences, Social Studies Units, *United States History

This high school unit on prejudice encountered by minority groups begins with contradictory descriptions of the character of American Democracy and raises the question, "Is American democracy intrinsically tolerant?" Then, students are invited to examine a number of specific episodes reflecting the treatment of various types of minority groups. A final brief selection from Gordon Allport's "The Nature of Prejudice" suggests the sociological factors that re-enforce prejudice, after which students are asked if Allport's generalizations apply to American society. (Author)

ED028191

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MINORITIES AND PREJUDICE IN AMERICA

Teacher and Student Manuals

(Public Domain Edition)

Frank Kane
and
Gary G. Baker

Committee on the Study of History
Amherst, Massachusetts

TE 499 949

EXPERIMENTAL MATERIAL
SUBJECT TO REVISION
PUBLIC DOMAIN EDITION

TEACHER'S MANUAL

MINORITIES AND PREJUDICE IN AMERICA

Frank Kane
Jefferson Union High School
Daly City, California

and

Gary G. Baker
Hamilton-Wenham Regional High School
Hamilton, Massachusetts

This material
has been produced by the
Committee on the Study of History,
Amherst, Massachusetts under contract with the
U.S. Office of Education as Cooperative Research Project #H-168.

INTRODUCTION

This unit is intended to have students consider prejudice toward various minority groups in American society, both the circumstances that have led to prejudice and the nature of prejudice itself. Two related questions which will be explored are: (1) Is there a connection between the characteristics of American democracy and the prejudice that has been demonstrated against some minorities? (2) Is the attitude of Americans toward different minorities determined by the nature of the minority, (e.g., race, religion, national origin), or is it a matter of the social and economic relationship of the minority group to the majority? Or a combination of these factors? There is also the possibility that prejudice is endemic in the American character, a possibility which will also be examined in this unit. This inquiry is not based on the assumption of any pre-ordained answer, for there is no certain answer to any of these questions. It is, in other words, an honest search into the nature of prejudice against minorities in the United States and is, therefore, a quest for an understanding of the human condition.

It should be especially meaningful to both the culturally deprived or the non-college preparatory student who has not often seriously considered this problem beyond his own personal and emotional reactions. He may be accustomed to being treated as a member of a minority himself but think of others outside his group as alien. The high school student, whether college preparatory or not, is extremely sensitive to group relationships. Thus, if the unit works as intended, the student may not only gain an historical perspective of the problems of minorities in America, but he may also be forced to analyze his own personal relationship and feelings toward minority groups, whether or not he is a member of one such group.

The unit is divided into seven sections. They may be used consecutively as outlined in the table of contents or in different order. Then again the teacher may choose to use only those sections which seem most pertinent to his class. This is, of course, the teacher's prerogative. The purpose of this teacher's manual is simply to suggest one way in which the unit might be used. There are certainly other valid approaches. If the larger intellectual focus as suggested in the first paragraph is to be maintained, however, it is probably important that the students read and consider the questions related to Sections I, II, and VII. Whether the teacher chooses to use all or merely some of the other sections will probably not preclude the consideration of the major questions of this unit. The teacher may decide to have the students write a paper after any of the sections, but only two are specifically suggested in this manual.

SECTION I

MY KITH AND KIN

Section I is designed to have the students personalize the problems which are discussed in this unit. The students might take the quiz in class and pass it in without signing their names. The teacher could then summarize the results on the board and discuss them with the class.

As can be readily seen, the statements begin with a very personal relationship and develop toward a very distant relationship. No particular results can be anticipated, but for some reason similar tests have always resulted in positive reactions toward Anglo-Saxon groups no matter what the character of the people being tested. Also, it might be expected that people will feel more comfortable when in a close relationship with members of their own group. If students are hesitant to commit themselves, they might be asked to name one group from the list that they would be most willing to marry into and so on through the list, and one group they would be least willing to marry into and so on through the list.

The results are probably not as important for class purposes as to have students discuss: (1) why they feel the way they do about various groups (e.g., why would they be willing to allow an English immigrant into their club but not a Mexican immigrant?); (2) what the possible social consequences are of identifiable attitudes; (3) whether particular attitudes ought to be changed; and (4) how attitudes can be changed, if this is possible at all.

SECTION II

DEMOCRACY AND THE MOB

This section is included to have the students consider the possibility that democracy may not be the best government to control prejudiced behavior. In fact, all the writers quoted in this section fear that mob action may take precedence over law and order when the majority does not feel that the law operated in accordance with its wishes.

Because the language and style of these writers is not easy, the teacher may first want to discuss exactly what each man said. After establishing this, the students might want to discuss the validity of the authors' positions on the basis of their own personal experiences. Some examples drawn from the statement of Fisher Ames: Why is governmental restraint of others and the governmental "power of law and justice over all" necessary to keep

individuals free? What would happen if this power did not exist, was weak or was ignored? On what basis might it be said that democracy excites and does not restrain uncontrolled emotions? Do you agree?

Is it true, as Tocqueville says, that an individual in the minority is pressured to go along with the majority? Have any students had this experience? How have they reacted?

Which, according to Cooper, is more important, the wishes of the people or law and order? According to you? Why is the law especially crucial to the minority? Is the majority likely to be right and just?

Finally, the students might consider Mencken's assertion that the majority or mob only respects its own judgment because it has been deluded into thinking that "democracy always come to the decisions in the long run"? Does it? As Mencken asks, on what evidence? Is it in the politician's interest to make people think this is the case? Why? Is the politician's ultimate obligation to the wishes of the majority or to established law? What are usually the motives of the majority? Is the politician or the majority really in charge?

By no means is the listing of the previous questions meant to reflect the possible structuring of the class. It could be interesting to let student questioning go where it might. Perhaps the students will consider some of the questions mentioned and perhaps not. They may talk about personal experiences related to the authors' abstractions, or they may want to argue with a particular abstraction on its own terms.

On the other hand, the teacher might feel that certain questions are crucial, and he may choose, or need, to raise them himself.

There might not be the time to consider all the possible implications in each of the four selections. The teacher may decide that a thorough analysis of just one of the authors is sufficient to develop a healthy skepticism in the students' minds which will help them to ask pertinent questions while considering the other sections.

SECTION III

RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN AMERICA

Before discussing this section, the students should probably begin to consider the difference between blind prejudice and rational discrimination. This is no easy task. If a person is opposed to a group because the group poses a threat to that person's cherished beliefs and institutions, is that prejudice? Or is it simply common sense to be wary of the "outside" group? Prejudice is literally defined as pre-judgment without just grounds or before sufficient knowledge. But that does not tell us what is just, and what is sufficient knowledge in particular instances. Is it simply good sense to be on your guard against certain groups for the sake of your own security and the maintenance of cherished values? It might get students involved if you ask whether they think the positions they took on the first day on the various groups was prejudiced or was based on "just grounds and sufficient knowledge." After a discussion of this nature, the question of what is, and is not, prejudice probably will be foremost in their minds while reading the rest of the unit.

This section is intended to have the students question why Americans have not been tolerant of religious minorities. The primary task is to pin down the reasons, as the student can see them, for the attitudes and actions of the majority toward each of the minority groups, and then to try to ascertain whether the intolerance that was demonstrated was because the majority refused to consider the possible merits of another religion and/or because that religion was a threat to the majority's beliefs and institutions, and/or because the minority group was indeed being sacreligious from the majority's point of view. In other words, would a religious group be the victim of bigotry if it posed no threat to the majority but simply had different religious beliefs?

In Part A of Section III the treatment afforded to Quakers in Puritan New England is the topic. In the first selection Judge Keeling makes it quite clear that he does consider the Quakers a threat to Puritan society because they will not take an oath. Is his concern merited? If so, is the action of the Puritans as described in the second reading a reasonable response? The Quakers were allowed to leave the Puritan colony, so why didn't they? Why did Mary Dyer decide to return to Boston despite what she knew would be her fate? The students might being to perceive that there was a clear principle that Mary Dyer died for--the principle of minority rights. But the Puritans were also acting on principle --the principle of necessary conformity for the sake of not only the Puritan society's security and well-being, but also for the sake of religious principles, in which they believed profoundly.

Uniform religious and governmental principles were intertwined as the basis of this theocracy. Doesn't a society have a right to protect its principles? Were the Quakers a real threat? The Jehovah's Witnesses case on saluting the flag in contemporary America might be cited.

The Mormons are the focus of Part B. Unlike the rest of the groups, this religious minority is native to the United States, but had even a harder time finding a secure home than did the Quakers. The first two selections describe the maltreatment they faced. As in the other parts, the key question is why was this group mistreated, and the best evidence in this unit is the short selection by non-Mormon, John Coyner (B, #3). Polygamy and "Mormon power and principles" are seen as threats to the "principles upon which our free institutions are established." Its ironic that Coyner opposes the Mormons because they "will not obey the laws of the land," and yet the actions against Mormons described in the first two selections are not legal. Do the Mormons pose a real threat? How? Must they be "wiped out in blood" if they will not succumb to American law? It is notable that most of the bitter discrimination against them ended when polygamy ended. Americans seemed to see polygamy as a threat to their traditional values. And yet, was it really? Was it "similar" to slavery? Would Americans react in the same way if polygamy was revived by the Mormons?

In Part C violence is also demonstrated against the Catholics with the burning of the convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts. This is a good example of how vicious rumors can bring out the worst in mobs. Did they see the Catholics as a threat? How? Perhaps the rumor of the "imprisonment" tended to re-affirm their apprehensions. The Ku Klus Klan statement outlines one possible general fear that has been typical of the attitude of non-Catholic Americans, that the Catholics are carrying out a political plot to take over the nation. This fear, based to some extent on the unity of Church and State in the Middle Ages, is at the heart of much of the anti-Catholic attitudes, but is by no means all-inclusive.

In Part D Michael Gold discusses the problem of prejudice from the point of view of the Jews. The story helps pose the question of "who is the minority" very nicely. In a certain part of New York Gold was in the majority and felt at home, but in a nearby geographic area he was in the minority and feared for his life. Why did he fear the Italians? Why did they seem to hate him? On what basis was he in the minority?

This story also gives some clues as to how stereotypes are developed and why. The Italian boys are really attacking the stereotype of "the Christ-Killers" they learned from parents. Gold, as an individual, is in no way a threat to them. Gold's stereotype of the Italians seems to have been reinforced because

the Italians acted on their stereotype of Jews. This and the blatent statement by James B. True seem to be clear examples of prejudice, although True sees the Jews as "the source of all our troubles." The students might consider how these stereotypes are developed.

SECTION IV

IMMIGRANT MINORITIES IN AMERICA

The primary goal of this section is to have the students become aware of the economic factor in discrimination against minorities. Perhaps the negative attitudes and actions of the majority toward certain minorities are as much a consequence of the social class barriers between them as any other factor.

The immigrants often came to the United States for economic reasons, and Handlin describes vividly the economic conditions they fell into in the United States. The working men and working girls were faced with a vicious economic cycle that was difficult to break away from. Some relevant questions in Part A are: How did the immigrants get into the situations described? How might they get out of it? How can you explain the "fundamental ambiguity" that Handlin describes in his last paragraph? Why is it difficult to "make an American citizen out of a slum"?

Part B provides us with two examples of immigrants adjusting to American life and succeeding. How did they do it? What made them different from the immigrants described by Handlin?

If Carnegie can succeed, why can't other immigrants? It is at this stage that the students might be asked to consider the basis of discrimination in the United States. Carnegie was a poor immigrant, but as a Scotsman he was not at the same disadvantage as the Chinese, Italians, or Puerto Ricans. Carnegie was, in fact, already assimilated to a great extent. He was part of the accepted white, protestant English-speaking tradition of the United States. However, Carnegie's own personal abilities and character cannot be ignored.

Of course, the teacher could cite numerous examples of second and third generation Americans of immigrant descent who have been great successes. Arthur Goldberg, who has been successively Secretary of Labor, Supreme Court Justice and now Ambassador to the United Nations, was the son of a poor Russian Jewish immigrant. Joseph P. Kennedy, the grandson of the Irish immigrant Patrick, was a phenomenally successful businessman and the American ambassador to Great Britain before his son became President of the United States.

Part C on the Irish immigrants and Part D on the Puerto Ricans serve as case studies of the problems of the immigrants. What are the problems common to both the Irish in the 19th century and to the Puerto Ricans today? How can these problems be overcome? Is assimilation necessary? Do the Puerto Ricans have any advantages which the Irish did not have? If so, is this because our attitudes and conditions have improved, or is this due to the basic differences between these two Catholic groups?

Part E illuminates the basic dichotomy in American attitudes toward immigrants. Theoretically, we are willing to open the door to the poor who are "yearning to breathe free," but often, in reality, the only people we have really wanted to come to the United States were people from that "pure unadulterated Anglo-Saxon stock." The Congressmen in these two selections represent this latter view. Why do they feel the way they do? Is their view representative of "the great body of Americans"? Why does the 1924 bill cut down on the quota of Southeastern Europeans and non-Europeans? Do Americans only want "typical Americans" in the United States? Who is this "typical American"?

A whole period could probably be spent just trying to answer Senator Smith's question: "Who is an American?" Will the Italian immigrant or German immigrant be any less of an American because of his background? Are Congressmen who favor unrestricted immigration or who opposed the quota system in 1924 "alien," "un-American" and "hostile to the institutions of this country" as Congressman Watkins asserted? What is the probable basis of such a charge? What do you think is the make-up of Congressman Watkins' constituency? Of Senator Smith's? A reference back to Mencken's statement in Section II is perhaps pertinent here.

SECTION V

RACIAL MINORITIES IN AMERICA

Section V is concerned with American attitudes toward racial minorities. The two major tasks in this section are: (1) to identify the bases of discrimination against racial minorities and to compare and contrast these with the attitudes of the majority toward other minority groups, and (2) to develop a hypothesis about the relationship of the American democratic system to the progress of civil rights reform.

The second goal is really a reference back to one of the two major questions mentioned in the introduction: Is there a connection between the characteristics of American democracy and the

prejudice that has been demonstrated against minorities? Because democracy allows the majority to express its will, does this mean that the majority has the right to act on the basis of prejudice? Is there a time, as James Fenimore Cooper said, when prejudice seems to take precedence over law? If so, is this necessarily bad? Aren't we concerned with carrying out the "will of the people"? Is this ultimately a government of laws or of men? In theory, does the majority have any rights that the minority does not have? In practice?

In Part A the treatment of the Indian is described. The perspective of the Indian is illuminating since, though truly a native American, he has been treated as an alien. In early American history the Indians are seen as savages to be removed, but perhaps Kneale was right when he said that they have simply been good students. Why have Indians been treated so harshly? The westward movement has always been looked upon as an heroic, patriotic chapter in American history, but from the view of the Indian it could very well be interpreted as blatent imperialism. Because of the manner in which the Indians have been treated in the past, does the government today have an obligation to help them in every way possible? Why should they be helped any more than any other group? Why weren't Indians allowed to vote before 1848? Can American society tolerate a sub-culture with different values, as represented by the Indians? In fact, should such sub-cultures be encouraged as important to the strength of diversity in American society? These are just some of the questions relating to Part A which might be considered.

The whole problem is tied up neatly in the first selection in Part B. Is Tocqueville right when he states that "the majority claims the right not only of making the laws, but of breaking the laws it has made"?

But the problem is perhaps over-simplified by Tocqueville. The second selection, the excerpt from Strong's diary, gives us evidence that a minority group, as well as the majority, can act illegally and passionately on the basis of prejudice. An interesting mixture of prejudice and persecution complex caused the Irish minority, disparagingly referred to by Strong, to lash out not only against the majority, as predicted by Tocqueville, but also against another minority--the Negroes. Anglo-Saxon Strong obviously looks down on the Irish, and the Irish persecute the Negroes. Do we all need scapegoats?

Documents 3 and 4 on the situation in Cicero, Illinois, are included for two reasons: (1) to make students aware that riots are not just Negro ghetto or Southern manifestations; and (2) to provide an opening for speculation about why immigrant minority groups, such as the Irish in New York City in 1863 and the Americans of eastern European ancestry in a contemporary suburb of

Chicago, seem so violently opposed to the Negro. Although we are talking about minority groups within the United States when we speak of the Irish and eastern Europeans, they form the majority in certain sections of the United States and function as such. It might have been difficult for students to pin point prejudice against minorities in the beginning sections, but the problem becomes even more perplexing when we have a difficult time even identifying a minority. The shifting sands of prejudice seem to depend on which group forms a majority in a particular place at a particular time. Is there something about democracy or about American society that causes an oppressed people, such as the Puritans, Irish, and eastern Europeans, to in turn treat other minority groups harshly?

If students prefer to put the blame on the nature of democracy, Josephine Baker's statement (B, #10) should give them cause to pause. Why wasn't Josephine Baker a victim of prejudice in France as well as in the United States? The heritage of the down-trodden slave in American society is, of course, a factor that the American Negro has had to overcome in the United States. Such a heritage is foreign to French soil and, at least in the case of the Negro, the unique history of American society plays a strong role in the development of prejudice against the Negro. But the students may see it differently and a free-wheeling discussion on the topic of minorities vs. minorities might be illuminating.

A comparison of documents 4 and 5 on Cicero make it quite clear that prejudice is not easily or quickly rooted out by law or by good intentions. Fifteen years after the Cicero riot a Negro still is not allowed to live in Cicero. But, looking at it from the point of view of the inhabitants of Cicero, is there anything that says they have to allow Negroes in? If freedom of choice exists why don't they, as a majority in Cicero, have a right to refuse entry to a Negro since this may threaten their property values or sense of comfort? Will it, really?

The Bilbo interview (#5) is self-explanatory. The contradictory, illogical and evasive nature of Bilbo's diatribe is obvious, but what is perhaps more to the point is the question of why this man believes as he does, and why he is elected. If we can try to understand the point of view of the minority groups, perhaps it behooves us to try to understand such men as Senator Bilbo without being condescending. What in the history of the South makes it so difficult for him to see Negroes as equals?

Document 6 on school integration indicates again that although a law is passed this does not necessarily mean that it will be acted on. If students begin to think that reality is determined better in newspapers, despite interpretive biases, than in the law books, they might well be on the right track.

Although change seems to be constant in American history, revolutionary change is rare. The Southern reaction to the 1954 Supreme Court decision is, perhaps, a part of the nature of democracy. Such a governmental decision would probably be carried out immediately in a dictatorship. It may be that slow change is just as well, though perhaps not for the victims of intransigence.

At any rate, the Newsweek poll (#7) makes it clear that in a democracy the attitudes of people will determine the extent of the acceptance of the law. If they think the Negro is going too fast, as this poll reveals, their majority attitude will probably prevail. Is the law ahead of the majority's attitudes? Can the enforcement of the law help change attitudes, or will it simply freeze attitudes into stubborn resistance? Is the white consensus described in this article going to cause the Negro to hate more and react violently, or is it going to make change less painful? It is notable that although the chart (#8) shows that the Southern whites are more wary of the Negro, there still is a large segment of Northern whites who hold similar views.

Should the Negro be given compensation for his sufferings and lost wages, as suggested by Martin Luther King (#9)? Is it enough to pass and enforce laws? Is it even enough to develop an attitude of "genuine good will" as King calls it? Should the Negroes be paid back for their years of deprivation? Should they be given special advantages just as the G.I. was? Are the two cases similar? Will such measures eventually help Americans to think of all United States citizens of different races as simply "Americans," not "white and colored Americans."

It is difficult to say whether the simple fact that a man has different colored skin causes people to make pre-judgments and to be distrustful. In evaluating the development of prejudice the early Indian wars and the poverty-stricken state of many contemporary Indians and the African origins, slave heritage and low economic and social status of the Negro must be considered as possible contributing factors. There are also economic and political factors that have contributed to bias against Orientals.

For instance, the American government decided it was a matter of security to round up and imprison all Japanese people living in the United States because they happened to have the same color skin and origins as the national group which had bombed Pearl Harbor (Part C). Was this simple a political move necessary for the security of the country? Was it really necessary to ignore the "due process of law" clause of our constitution? Robert Cushman says no, and General DeWitt says yes. But, in any case, must a complete race be held responsible for what one segment does, simply because that race is the minority and easy to identify?

Although there was suspicion and bias against Americans of German extraction in both World Wars, they were not treated the same way as were the Japanese. It would probably be a leading question to ask why.

Just as the treatment of the Japanese was based to a large extent on political circumstances, the treatment of the Chinese immigrants in the West in the latter part of the 19th century was a result of economic changes (Part D). The Chinese were welcomed when there was a labor shortage, but as soon as there was competition for jobs, because of the migration of American Easterners into the West after the completion of the transcontinental railroad, a "Yellow Peril" quickly developed, and Westerners decided that "The Chinese must go!" It is not surprising that a workingmen's party led the opposition to the Chinese. But why wasn't there also opposition to white "immigrants" from the East who also provided competition for jobs? To what extent was the opposition simply a matter of economic considerations? Was it also based on racial differences? On the "religion and ancient beliefs" of the Chinese? On their "contempt for Western civilization"? On their criminal record? Or were these latter points simply rationalizations for getting rid of an easily identifiable group of economic competitors?

It is an interesting irony that an immigration officer who was himself an Italian immigrant should speak so critically and condescendingly of the Chinese immigrants. The Italian immigrants were also referred to as "foreigners," and Senator Smith obviously did not have them in mind when he wanted to help build "a pure, unadulterated American citizenship" (IV, E, #3). Was it necessary for the security and well-being of the nation to exclude the Chinese from immigrating to the United States? Is it more difficult for them to "assimilate"? Is it true that the differences between East and West are so profound that "the twain" will never meet?

After reading these first five sections, the students might be asked to write a paper on what the ultimate purpose of American society should be--to be a nation for the preservation of a splendid stock or as an asylum for the oppressed of all countries. If this does not seem appropriate at this stage, students might be asked to write on one of the major questions of the unit: Are the attitudes of Americans toward different minorities determined by the nature of the minority, and/or the social and economic relationship of the minority to the majority, and/or are they peculiar to the American people? More specifically, would a wealthy, high class Negro Jew who has recently come from his country, the Congo, be as acceptable to most Americans as a high class white, protestant native American of English extraction?

SECTION VI

MINORITY OPINION: THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNPOPULAR CAUSE

Section VI is somewhat different in that the individuals described are not members of any racial minority nor religious minority, and all are native Americans. They simply hold very controversial opinions with which the majority of Americans have disagreed. Not only has the majority disagreed, but some individuals who have been part of the majority have been actively intolerant of the dissenting opinion and react in much the same way as Torqueville predicted in Section II.

The major question here is why the majority chooses to ignore law and order so as to stop dissent. Is it true that the majority will not tolerate dissent no matter what the national character of the democracy? Or is this reaction peculiar to the American character? There is the possibility that the people who react violently against those who represent a minority opinion do not reflect accurately the character of the majority. But it is difficult to generalize on this, as it is in many other related matters.

As in other portions of the unit, this section reveals that it is often people's attitudes, not laws, which determine what happens between groups of people. Despite the First Amendment's guarantee of free press, Lovejoy was killed by a "local majority" for printing views which were not acceptable in that particular part of the country at that time. Despite the First Amendment's guarantee of the freedom of religion (if Atheism can be interpreted as religion) and freedom to petition the government for a redress of grievances, Madalyn Murray's actions have earned her the title of "the most hated woman in America," caused her to lose a job and caused her sons to be beaten up numerous times in much the same way as the Italian boys attempted to beat up the Jewish boy. Despite the First Amendment's guarantee of freedom of speech and freedom to assemble peaceably, George Lincoln Rockwell has been harassed and attacked for expressing his views to groups of people. Of course, Rockwell's case gets into the more sticky question of whether a man who advocates and encourages hatred toward and actions against minority groups, such as Jews and Negroes, ought himself to be tolerated. Many people who attacked Rockwell felt they were doing so in the name of freedom and democracy. But were they? There is also the question of whether Rockwell's speeches and assemblies constituted a "clear and present danger" to the public because they helped to incite riots. A three-judge panel decided that there was no violation of the law. But should we tolerate people who try to breed hate?

It might be relevant to this section, and may be pertinent, to raise the question of minority rights through a discussion of whether a school, which naturally reflects the values of the majority, has a right to expel male students who have long hair. This has been a prominent issue in many schools in different parts of the country.

SECTION VII

SOCIETY AND PREJUDICE

In the last section psychologist Gordon Allport lists the social factors which he thinks lead to prejudice in general. The students may have difficulty understanding exactly what Allport is saying because of his abstract generalizations and sociological terminology.

An attempt has been made to make the language more comprehensible by use of brackets and footnotes. But if after trying to get the students to put these generalizations into their own words they still do not seem to understand Allport's points, the teacher may need to paraphrase Allport's generalizations and use concrete examples to illuminate his points. Allport does this quite well himself in Chapter 14 of The Nature of Prejudice.

The students might be asked to discuss whether these characteristics are in fact conditions which prevail in American society. If this does seem to be the case, the next question might be: Is prejudice in America inevitable? Does the basic structure of American society have to be changed radically to discourage prejudice or can intolerance be diminished despite the inherent characteristics of society?

Judge Learned Hand's statement summarizes very nicely one of the major points of this unit: "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it."

The students might be asked to write a final paper on whether they think hatred of minority groups can ever die in this country. If so, how? If not, why not? They might also be encouraged to go one step further and explain what their answer tells them about themselves, and how their lives as individuals will be effected if their conclusion is correct.

BR-5-1071
PA-24
OE-BR

EXPERIMENTAL MATERIAL
SUBJECT TO REVISION
PUBLIC DOMAIN EDITION

STUDENT'S MANUAL

MINORITIES AND PREJUDICE IN AMERICA

Frank Kane
Jefferson Union High School
Daly City, California

and

Gary G. Baker
Hamilton-Wenham Regional High School
Hamilton, Massachusetts

This material has been produced
by the
Committee on the Study of History, Amherst, Massachusetts
under contract with the U. S. Office of Education
as Cooperative Research Project #H-168.

NOTE TO THE PUBLIC DOMAIN EDITION

This unit was prepared by the Committee on the Study of History, Amherst College, under contract with the United States Office of Education. It is one of a number of units prepared by the Amherst Project, and was designed to be used either in series with other units from the Project or independently, in conjunction with other materials. While the units were geared initially for college-preparatory students at the high school level, experiments with them by the Amherst Project suggest the adaptability of many of them, either wholly or in part, for a considerable range of age and ability levels, as well as in a number of different kinds of courses,

The units have been used experimentally in selected schools throughout the country, in a wide range of teaching/learning situations. The results of those experiments will be incorporated in the Final Report of the Project on Cooperative Research grant H-168, which will be distributed through ERIC.

Except in one respect, the unit reproduced here is the same as the experimental unit prepared and tried out by the Project. The single exception is the removal of excerpted articles which originally appeared elsewhere and are under copyright. While the Project received special permission from authors and publishers to use these materials in its experimental edition, the original copyright remains in force, and the Project cannot put such materials in the public domain. They have been replaced in the present edition by bracketed summaries, and full bibliographical references have been included in order that the reader may find the material in the original.

This unit was initially prepared in the summer of 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I - MY KITH AND KIN..... 1

II - DEMOCRACY AND THE MOB..... 2

III - RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN AMERICA..... 6

A. The Quakers in Puritan New England..... 6
B. The Mormons and the Nineteenth Century Westward Movement..... 7
C. The Catholics, 1834 and 1924..... 9
D. The Jews in Twentieth Century America..... 12

IV - IMMIGRANT MINORITIES IN AMERICA..... 13

A. The Uprooted..... 13
B. The Immigrant Businessman..... 14
C. The Irish in Boston..... 15
D. The Puerto Ricans in New York..... 15
E. The Golden Door..... 16

V - RACIAL MINORITIES IN AMERICA..... 19

A. The Indians..... 19
B. The Negroes..... 22
C. The Japanese-Americans..... 28
D. The Chinese-Americans..... 29

VI - MINORITY OPINION: THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNPOPULAR CAUSE..... 32

A. The Abolitionist..... 32
B. The Atheist..... 32
C. The Nazi..... 33
D. The First Amendment..... 33

VII - SOCIETY AND PREJUDICE..... 35

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING..... 36

SECTION I

MY KITH AND KIN

All of us come from some particular national, racial and religious backgrounds. All of us have certain attitudes toward people from similar or from different backgrounds. The following quiz will help you to recognize how you feel about certain categories of people. In the right hand column is a list of various groups of people. In the left hand column are statements that you might or might not make with reference to certain groups in the list. Write the letter which is next to the name of each group right after any statements which you would make about that group. (Example: I would not admit members of the following group(s) to my club as personal friends: x, y, z.)

You might begin by filling in the three blanks that follow with your grandparents' birthplace, and your race and religion.

[The quiz asks the student to identify the extent to which he would permit a member of a minority group to become a member of his country, his neighborhood, his family, etc.[1]]

---

[1]This quiz is a revised version of one that was devised in 1928 by E. S. Bogardus, a social scientist. It is described briefly in Gordon Allport's book, The Nature of Prejudice (Addison-Wesley Co., Cambridge, Mass., 1954), 38-39.

SECTION II

DEMOCRACY AND THE MOB

Although we come from different ethnic, racial and religious backgrounds, almost all of us are, or intend to be, American citizens. Most American citizens support a democratic form of government, which is based on the belief that people should control their own political affairs. Many who believe in democracy also believe that man is basically good and wise. But the key to the successful functioning of a democracy is the acceptance by the people of the principle of majority rule.

The following four selections are brief evaluations of the democratic system.

1. The first was written by Fisher Ames, a conservative Federalist in the House of Representatives in the 1790's:[1]

> [Ames states that democracy is the worst form of government since it "never fails" to excite the passions and is "never found" to restrain the passions. Freedom is only achieved by the "due restraint of others."]

2. Alexis de Tocqueville, a 19th century French statesman and political philosopher, became famous for his book Democracy in America, written after a visit to the United States in 1831. This work is considered to be one of the finest observations of American democracy by a person from another country:[2]

> The right of governing society, which the majority supposes itself to derive from its superior intelligence, was introduced into the United States by its first settlers. . . .

---

[1] As quoted in Arthur Ekirch, Jr., ed., Voices in Dissent (Citadel Press, New York, 1964), 33-35.

[2] Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America (John Allyn, Boston, 1876), I, 326-327, 332, 337-339, 344.

[A]ll parties are willing to recognize the right of the majority, because they all hope at some time to be able to exercise them to their own advantage. The majority, therefore, in that country, exercise a prodigious actual authority, and a power of opinion which is nearly as great; no obstacles exist which can impede or even retard its progress, so as to make it heed the complaints of those whom it crushes upon its path. This state of things is harmful in itself, and dangerous for the future. . . .

When an individual or a party is wronged in the United States, to whom can he apply for redress? If to public opinion, public opinion constitutes the majority; if to the legislature, it represents the majority, and . . . obeys it; if to the executive power, it is appointed by the majority, and serves as a passive tool in its hands. The public force consists of the majority under arms; the jury is the majority invested with the right of hearing judicial cases; and in certain States, even the judges are elected by the majority. However iniquitous or absurd the measure of which you complain, you must submit to it as well as you can. . . .

[T]he majority possesses a power which is physical and moral at the same time, which acts upon the will as much as upon the actions, and represses not only all contest, but all controversy.

I know of no country in which there is so little independence of mind and real freedom of discussion [as] in America. . . .

In America, the majority raises formidable barriers around the liberty of opinion: within these barriers an author may write what he pleases; but woe to him if he goes beyond them . . . he is exposed to continued obloquy and persecution. His political career is ended forever, since he has offended the only authority which is able to open it. Every sort of compensation, even that of celebrity, is refused to him. Before publishing his opinions he imagined that he held them in common with others; but no sooner had he declared them, than he is loudly censured by his opponents, whilst those who think like him, without having the courage to speak out, abandon him in silence. He yields at length, overcome by the daily effort which he has to make and subsides into silence, as if he felt remorse for having spoken the truth. . . .

The master [the majority] . . . says, "You are free to think differently from me, and to retain your life, your prosperity, and all that you possess; but you are henceforth a stranger among your people. You may retain your civil rights, but they will be useless to you, for you will never be chosen by your fellow-citizens, if you solicit their votes;

> and they will affect to scorn you, if you ask for their esteem. You will remain among men, but you will be deprived of the rights of mankind. Your fellow-creatures will shun you like an impure being; and even those who believe in your innocence will abandon you, lest they should be shunned in their turn. Go in peace! I have given you your life, but it is an existence worse than death." . . .
>
> If ever the free institutions of America are destroyed, that event may be attributed to the omnipotence of the majority, which may at some future time urge the minorities to desperation; and oblige them to have recourse to physical force.

3. James Fenimore Cooper is famous as an author of early American adventure stories about pioneers and Indians, but he also wrote frequently about American society in general, especially after he returned in the late 1830's from a trip to Europe. The following is drawn from a book he wrote in 1838 entitled The American Democrat:[3]

> All attempts in the publick . . . to do that which the publick has no right to do, should be frowned upon as the precise form in which tyranny is the most apt to be displayed in a democracy. . . .
>
> [W]e see neighborhoods, in which oppressive intolerance is manifested by the greater number, for the time being, to the habits of the less. This is a sore grievance, more especially, when, as is quite frequently the case, the minority happen to be in possession of usages that mark the highest stage of civilization. It ought never to be forgotten, therefore, that every citizen is entitled to indulge without comment or persecution, in all his customs and practices that are lawful and moral. Neither is morality to be regulated by the prejudices of sects, or social classes, but it is to be left strictly to the control of laws, divine and human. To assume the contrary is to make prejudice, and prejudice of a local origin, too, more imperious than the institutions. . . .
>
> The disgraceful desire to govern by means of mobs, which has become so prevalent, has arisen from misconceiving the rights of the publick. . . . for no civilized society can long exist, with an active power in its bosom that is stronger than the law. . . .

---

[3]James Fenimore Cooper, The American Democrat (H. & E. Phinney, Cooperstown, N.Y., 1838), 71, 76, 150-151.

4. H. L. Mencken was one of the most famous and controversial journalists and literary critics in the United States in the 1920's and early 1930's. From 1925 to 1933 he was the editor of a popular but often disputed journal, The American Mercury. His opinion on democracy follows:[4]

> [Mencken states that democracy is, in effect, rule by the "mob" and that there is no evidence that the "mob" is wise.]

---

[4]H. L. Mencken, ed. A Mencken Christomathy (Knopf and Co., New York, 1949), 164-165.

SECTION III

RELIGIOUS MINORITIES IN AMERICA

The following selections give various impressions of American attitudes toward certain religious minorities in America.

A. The Quakers in Puritan New England

Prejudice and intolerance had early beginnings in America. The Puritans were a religious minority in England who came to New England seeking freedom of religion, but they did not extend that freedom to other religious groups. The government established by these Puritans was willing to accept only Puritan religious beliefs.

In 1656 the General Court of Massachusetts passed an anti-Quaker act, fining any ship captain 100 pounds for bringing in Quakers from Europe. Other laws followed, providing severe penalties for Quakers found in the colony, including public beatings, prison sentences, and even executions.

1. In the following document one judge in Puritan New England explained why the Puritans opposed the Quakers:[1]

> [Judge Keeling states that the Quaker refusal to take an oath to the king is both a denial of Scripture as well as an act of "Rebellion and Blood." He argues that the Quakers are, in fact, subversives who want to overthrow the government.]

2. On October 27, 1659 three Quakers were scheduled to be executed on

---

[1]Jessamyn West, ed., The Quaker Reader (Viking Press, New York, 1962), 119-120.

Boston Common. A description of that incident and later developments follows:[3]

> [This document describes the hanging of the three Quakers. Two were hanged on the first day while a third, a woman, was given a reprieve and a chance to leave Massachusetts Bay. She refused, but the authorities, fearful of the public reaction if she were hanged, deporter her. She returned and was hanged, All three met death bravely, doing, as the woman proclaimed, the "will of my Father."]

B. The Mormons and the Nineteenth Century Westward Movement

The Mormons were founded in 1827 by Joseph Smith who claimed that he had earlier come upon a divine revelation written on plates of gold on a hillside in Palmyra, New York. According to Smith, these engraved plates told of the sacred history of the ancient inhabitants of North America. In 1830 Smith published his translation of this history and organized the Church of Latter-Day Saints (Mormon) at Fayette, New York. The Church grew rapidly and the Mormons attempted to develop settlements in Ohio, Missouri, and then Illinois, but met in all places with severe opposition from the local people.

In 1844 Smith and his followers were jailed in Carthage, Illinois, near their settlement in Nauvoo, and a mob broke in and killed Smith and his brother. Within two years the Mormons were expelled from the state. Under their new leader, Brigham Young, they migrated to the valley of the Great Salt Lake in Utah, which was then Mexican territory and founded Salt Lake City. After the Mexican War in 1848, they came under the jurisdiction of the United States again, and there was constant hostility between the Church and the government until polygamy[4] was

[4]In the case of the Mormons, this was the practice of men having two or more wives at the same time.

abandoned in 1890. Utah was admitted as the forty-fifth state in the Union in 1896.

1. Joseph Young described an incident which took place in Missouri:[5]

> [This is Joseph Young's account of a surprise attack on a Mormon community by about two hundred armed men. "Eighteen or nineteen" Mormons were killed, some of the bodies were mutilated, and their property was stolen. Young claims that some of the perpetrators of this "awful butchery" later openly boasted of their actions.]

2. The following incident recounted by Joseph Smith, took place before the migration to Utah:[6]

> [This selection describes the invasion of a number of Mormon homes by a dozen men, most of whom Smith recognized as being local people. Smith himself was beaten, tarred, and left naked in a field. "The mobbers", he relates were from various religious groups, especially Campbellites, Methodists, and Baptists.]

3. The author of the following article, John Coyner, was not a Mormon but he often attended Mormon church services, partly out of curiosity and partly because of his job as a journalist in Salt Lake City. In the following article he commented on a visit to the Mormon church:[7]

> [The article quotes two Mormon women who defend polygamy and proclaim "the sons and daughters of Zion are spreading over the whole land."
>
> Coyner sees this as a threat, by "religious fanatics," to overthrow the "free institutions" of the U. S. He claims that the Mormons are ready to "draw the sword" and fight for their beliefs.]

---

[5]William Mulder and A. Russell Mortensen, eds., Among the Mormons (Alfred Knopf, New York, 1958), 104-106. (Reprinted from AMONG THE MORMONS by William Mulder and A. R. Mortensen by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Copyright c, 1958 by William Mulder and A. R. Mortensen.)

[6]Ibid., 66-68.

[7]Ibid., 407-408.

C. The Catholics, 1834 and 1924

Catholics make up the largest religious minority group in the United States. The following two documents reveal some attitudes toward Catholics at two different times in American history, 1834 and 1924.

1. The August 16, 1834 issue of the New York Observer printed a description of the burning of a Catholic Convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts:[8]

DISGRACEFUL, OUTRAGE.

Burning of The Convent in Charlestown, Mass.

> On Monday night of last week, a mob in Charlestown, Mass. set fire to the Ursuline convent in that town, and burnt it to the ground. We copy from our Boston papers the particulars of the disgraceful outrage. It seems that a young lady, Elizabeth Harrison, the daughter of a gentleman in this city, who had been sent to the nummery to complete her education, became so pleased with the place and its inmates as to be induced to take the black veil; that subsequently either becoming dissatisfied, or under the influence of temporary derangement, she left the institution in the garb of a nun, and sought protection in the house of Mr. Edward Cutter, a gentleman in the neighborhood, who, at her request, conveyed her to the residence of a friend in West Cambridge. In this retreat she was soon visited by her brother and Bishop Fenwick, who persuaded her to return to the nunnery, with the understanding that she would be permitted to leave the institution at any time she should choose. Soon after rumors became current, that the young lady was detained in the convent against her will, and that her friends had called for her but she was not to be found. These rumors created a great excitement in the public mind, and on Monday there were indications that the lower classes of the people were preparing for some act of violence. With a view to counteract the false impression which had been produced, and to quiet the populace, Mr. Cutter, and the select-men of Charlestown, on Monday prepared statements of facts, and sent them for insertion in the Boston papers of Tuesday morning, but before the papers were issued, the Convent was in ashes.

---

[8] New York Observer, August 16, 1834.

From the Boston D. Advertiser of Wednesday.

Disgraceful Outrage.--We are called on to record one of the most scandalous acts of popular violence, ever perpetrated in this community. We announced in a postscript to our last paper, dated at a quarter past one o'clock, yesterday morning, that the Ursuline Convent, at Charlestown, was then in flames, having been set on fire by a mob assembled for the purpose. The Convent is situated on Mount Benedict, at the distance of about a mile from the central portion of Charlestown, and two or three miles from this city. The principal building was an edifice of brick, about eighty feet in length, and four stories high. Among the other buildings were a farm house and cottage, The inmates of the convent were the Lady Superior, five or six nuns, three female attendants, and from fifty to sixty children, placed there by their friends, principally Protestants, for the purpose of instruction.

At a little after 11 o'clock on Monday night, an alarm of fire was given in this city and the neighboring towns, produced by the burning of several tar barrels in the neighborhood ofthe convent. It appears thst this must have been a preconcerted signal, for assembling, among the mass of citizens who would be collected, a large number who had entered into a combination for the destruction of the convent. A party of fifty to a hundred persons, or perhaps more, disguised by fantastic dresses and painted faces, assembled before the convent, and after warning the inmates who had all retired to rest, by loud noises and threats of violence to make their excape, proceeded to make an actual assault upon the house. The ladies of the convent, alarmed by these threats of violence, immediately awoke the children under their charge, and with them retreated from the rear of the house through the garden and made their escape to some of the neighboring dwellings. The assailants pressed the evacuation of the house with such haste, that it is said they laid violent hands on the lady superior to hasten her movements; the distress and terror of the scene were heightened by the solicitude of the nuns for one of their number, who is confined to her bed by a disease from which she is not expected to recover. The assailants forced open the doors and windows of the convent, carried most of the furniture, among which were three piano fortes, a harp, and other musical instruments, into the yard and then destroyed it. At about half-past twelve o'clock they set fire to the building in the second story, and in a short time it was entirely destroyed.

A great number of persons were assembled at the spot, and were witnesses of these transactions. We are unable

> to account for it, that no measures were taken to repress them. We do not learn that any magistrate or police officer came upon the ground. Several fire companies from this city, from Charlestown, and from Cambridge, repaired to the scene on the first alarm, and when they ascertained the cause of the alarm a part of them returned home. A number of the fire companies however were present during the conflagration, and the effectual measures which were taken to suppress it, appear to have been overruled by the great number of tpersons assembled, many of them evidently from a distance, for the apparent purpose of encouraging and aiding the work of destruction.
>
> Besides the nunnery several other buildings belonging to the establishment were also burnt. The fire was deliberately communicated to the Chapel, to the Bishop's Lodge, the stables, and the old Nunnery, a large wooden building situated at a short distance from the others. It is asserted also, that the cemetery was opened, and its contents taken out and exposed to view. The work of destruction was continued until day-light, when the mob dispersed.

2. In November, 1925, the Ku Klux Klan was re-organized at a meeting held on Stone Mountain, Georgia. Patterned after its post-Civil War predecessor, it was active against such minority groups as Negroes, Jews, immigrants and Catholics. With pockets of strength in both the north and the south, the Klan reportedly reached its peak strength of some five million members in the mid 1920's. The following statement was issued by an official member of the Klan interested in maintaining "true Americanism":[9]

> [The statement claims that Jews are trying to "dominate" the economy, Catholics are determined to "dominate" politics and religion, and immigration is an attack on Protestantism. The "Romish Church" is seen as antithetical to "our" public schools, "a free press, free speech, and to other democratic principles."]

---

[9]The Fiery Cross, February 8, 1924

D. The Jews in Twentieth Century America

Throughout their history the Jews have probably been the most persecuted religious minority group in the world. Certain American attitudes toward the Jews emerge from the following two articles.

1. The first selection gives us a glimpse of life in New York City in 1910 as seen through the eyes of a Jewish boy, Michael Gold, who lived in a Jewish neighborhood on the east side of New York City:[10]

> [Gold relates an incident in which he ventures into an Italian neighborhood only to be beaten and chased by a gang of Italian boys. Their screams of "Christ-killer" lead him to ask his mother about Christ and the coming of the Messiah. She refers him to a local merchant who tries to enlighten him. He is disappointed when he hears that the Messiah will conquer with love instead of annihilating "our enemies."]

2. Mr. James B. True, a strong anti-Jewish leader of the 1930's, had invented and applied for a patent on "an extra-heavy policeman's club" which he called a "kike-killer." Details on this weapon, as well as an insight into True's personality, have been furnished by Dr. L. M. Birkhead, National Director of the Friends of Democracy, who wrote the following article shortly after an interview with True:[11]

> [In the interview, True explains his belief that all of America's problems are caused by the Jews. In the South, Jews have hired Negroes to attack white women. Communism, however, is the "major part" of the "Jewish conspiracy" which the New Deal is forcing on America. True advocates genocide by secret armed gangs as the answer.]

---

[10]Michael Gold, Jews Without Money (Liveright Co., New York, 1930), 185-190.

[11]Donald S. Strong, Organized Anti-Semitism in America (American Council on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C., 1941), 125-126. [Footnotes omitted.]

SECTION IV

IMMIGRANT MINORITIES IN AMERICA

In the previous section you read about American attitudes toward religious minorities. Some of the readings in this section provide descriptions of the life of the immigrant in America, focusing on his economic condition. Many of the immigrants were considered to be members of a minority group not only because they had come from a foreign country, but also because they held religious beliefs with which the majority of Americans did not agree. Thus they were often treated in the main as were the groups described in Section III.

The immigrant came to America in search of a better life. Most had heard that America was blessed with religious and political freedom, and economic opportunity. They were thus willing to leave their family and friends, familiar language, and familiar customs, in order to go to "the land of opportunity."

A. The Uprooted

1. Oscar Handlin, a noted historian, described the life the immigrant actually faced in America around the turn of the century:[1]

> [This selection describes the conditions of unemployment, hunger, low wages, menial work, and filth that were the common lot of the immigrant. Older Americans saw this poverty as ascribable to the "defects of the newcomers." Indeed there was a "fundamental ambiguity" in the thinking of the Anglo-Saxons who complained about the immigrants' failure to assimilate while, at the same time, did everything they could to isolate themselves from the immigrants.]

---

[1]Oscar Handlin, The Uprooted (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1951), 74-77, 151-153, 155-156, 272-274. (Reproduced from THE UPROOTED, copyright, 1951 by Oscar Handlin, with permission of Atlantic-Little, Brown & Co., Publishers.)

2. The following description of "working girls" was written by Jacob Riis, an immigrant himself whose moving articles publicized the conditions under which the poor lived in the tenement districts of New York:[2]

> [Riis describes the poor working conditions and low wages of minors in the garment district. Although the legislature has passed laws against child-labor, the enforcement provisions are hopelessly inadequate. Many girls turn to early marriage as an escape.]

B. The Immigrant Businessman

Although most immigrants remained in the city where they expected to find better employment opportunities, some became peddlars travelling from town to town.

1. Following is an excerpt from the diary of Abraham Kohn, a young German Jew who sold his wares throughout New England in 1842-1843:[3]

> [Kohn compares his life in Europe, and what it might have been, with his existence in America. He finds that although he would have been persecuted and heavily taxed in Europe, he would not be confronted with the hostility and strangeness of the Americans. Family life has been destroyed and he regrets his decision to come to America.]

2. Following is a brief biographical sketch of an immigrant from Scotland, Andrew Carnegie:[4]

---

[2]Jacob A. Riis, How The Other Half Lives, Studies Among the Tenements of New York (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1890), 234-238.

[3]Abram Vossen Goodman, "A Jewish Peddler's Diary," American Jewish Archives, III, 3 (June, 1951), 96, 98, 100, 102, 106.

[4]Richard B. Morris, ed., Encyclopedia of American History (Harper & Row, New York, 1965), 684.

[The article lists the important dates and events in Carnegie's rise from poverty to enormous wealth.]

C. The Irish in Boston

The following selection is drawn from a biography of Joseph P. Kennedy, the father of President John F. Kennedy. It focuses on the life of Patrick Kennedy, John Kennedy's great grandfather. In 1848 Ireland was in the middle of a disastrous "potato famine", and potatoes being the staple in the Irish diet. Before the famine was over one million Irish died of starvation, exposure, typhus, cholera and relapsing fever. The 150,000 who made their way to America in 1848 were pursuing their one last hope:[5]

[The passage describes the "subhuman" voyage from Ireland, the difficulties caused by thousands of illiterate and unskilled people pouring into Boston and the living conditions of the Irish immigrant. The expanding economy of the country did require unskilled labor, however, and the Irish were absorbed, but not assimilated, into American life. The immigrants of Boston soon developed a "common consciousness" that was seen by the native Americans as a dangerous "foreign element."]

D. The Puerto Ricans in New York

Although the Puerto Ricans who came to the mainland cannot be classified as immigrants since they are United States citizens, they have faced many of the problems of the immigrant, The following describes the conditions which confronted the Puerto Rican newcomer to New York City in the early 1950's:[6]

---

[5] Richard J. Whalen, The Founding Father: The Story of Joseph P. Kennedy (New American Library, New York, 1964), 8-13. [Footnotes omitted.]

[6] Blake Clark, "The Puerto Rican Problem in New York," The Reader's Digest, February, 1953, 61-63, 65.

[This passage describes the arrival of Puerto Ricans in New York and how their "poverty and inadequate English" confine them to squalid tenements. Spanish Harlem is characterized as dominated by disease, delinquency and crime. The passage concludes with a statement that "eventually they can be assimilated throughout the country."]

E. The Golden Door

The Statue of Liberty, which stands in New York Harbor, was given to the United States by France in 1884, a symbol of the liberty which citizens enjoy under a free government. A poem entitled "The New Colossus" by Emma Lazarus was inscribed on a tablet in the pedestal in 1903. The last five lines read as follows:[7]

> . . . Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
> The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
> Send these the homeless, tempest tossed to me,
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door!

In 1924 Congress passed a new immigration law by which immigration in any year was limited to 2% of the number of each national group living in the United States according to the census of 1890, with a maximum quota of 150,000. The effect of this law was to reduce the number of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, while Japanese and Chinese were absolutely excluded from immigrating to the United States. The McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 generally kept the provisions of the 1924 Act on the maximum number of immigrants allowed (150,000) and the 2%

---

[7]Emma Lazarus, "The New Colossus" (1883), Poems (Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1889), I, 203.

quota system, but it removed the ban against immigration of Asian and Pacific peoples. The Immigration Act of 1965 ended the system of national quotas. According to this new law 160,800 immigrants are allowed into the United States on a first-come, first-served basis but people with special skills are given preference.

1. Following is an excerpt from a speech given by Congressman Watkins of Oregon in the House, April 5, 1924:[8]

> [This bill] excludes Japanese and their kind--all races ineligible for citizenship in this country. The sooner this Congress lays down the proposition of not admitting the people of those nations who can not assimilate, who can not become a part of our blood, our tongue, our life, and our ways, the sooner will we begin to mirror the sentiments and the wishes of the great body of Americans who want America for Americans[Applause]. . . .
>
> I challenge those gentlemen who represent the congressional districts overwhelmingly alien not only in name but sentiment and whose very soul is un-American and hostile to the institutions of this country to show wherein there is discrimination [Applause].
>
> Gentlemen, there is no discrimination . . . but suppose there is discrimination, suppose we do discriminate against those countries, suppose we discriminate against southeastern Europe, I claim there is justification for it. I claim the American people have the right to discriminate against those nations who have not used the hospitality of this country as invited guests ought to use it. This country is like a large household. I can tell a Chinaman, or an Italian or a Greek or a Japanese in Portland, Oregon, "You can not come into my home; I am not inviting you there." If I want to invite my friend from Ohio, Mr. Burton to come in, it is my business and nobody else's. That is the way with America--we can invite Englishmen or whom we please.

2. From a speech given by Senator Smith of South Carolina in the Senate on April 9, 1924:[9]

---

[8] Congressional Record, LXV, part 6, 3677-5678.

[9] Ibid., 5961.

I think we now have sufficient population in our country for us to shut the door and to breed up a pure, unadulterated American citizenship. I recognize that there is a dangerous lack of distinction between people of a certain nationality and the breed of the dog. Who is an American? Is he an immigrant from Italy? Is he an immigrant from Germany? If you were to go abroad and some one were to meet you and say, "I met a typical American," what would flash into your mind as a typical American, the typical representative of that new Nation? Would it be the son of an Italian immigrant, the son of a German immigrant, the son of any of the breeds from the Orient, the sons of the denizens of Africa? . . . It is the breed of the dog in which I am interested. . . . Thank God we have in America perhaps the largest percentage of any country in the world of pure unadulterated Anglo-Saxon stock; certainly the greatest of any nation in the Nordic breed. It is for the preservation of that splendid stock that has characterized us that I would make this not an asylum for the oppressed of all countries, but a country to assimilate and perfect that splendid type of manhood that has made America the foremost Nation in her progress and in her power, and yet the youngest of all the nations. . . .

Without offense, but with regard to the salvation of our own, let us shut the door. . . .

SECTION V

RACIAL MINORITIES IN AMERICA

It is not always possible to identify instantly the immigrant recently off the boat or the person holding a religious belief not shared by the majority of America. Not until his background is revealed is he treated with disrespect by some Americans. But the members of racial minorities are readily identifiable.

A. The Indians

Actually, the Indian is the only real native American. Since the latter part of the fifteenth century, immigrants have been arriving in America, many have looked upon "the Red Man" as merely an obstacle in their path.

1. In 1744 the Massachusetts General Court declared open season on Indians, offering 300 pounds for each scalp. Needless to say, this made Indian killing a very popular sport. Captain James Cargill, a native of Newcastle, Maine, then a part of Massachusetts, was one of the many avid Indian bounty hunters. The following was drawn from his diary:[1]

> [Cargill describes his adventures tracking, killing and scalping an Indian.]

2. The Nez Percé Indians of the Pacific Northwest were typical of numerous tribes which were eventually forced to surrender to federal troops and sent to government reservations. One of the Nez Percé's Chiefs, Joseph, who had taken the name from his Christian father, refused to

---

[1]Joseph Berger and Dorothy Berger, eds., Diary of America (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1957), 66-67.

sign any treaties with the government, because in the past it had broken so many. He refused to give up land which he felt rightfully belonged to his people. When the Nez Percés were ordered to a reservation in 1877, some renegades revolted against the United States troops, and the Army proceeded to retaliate. The Nez Percés escaped into Montana. Finding no refuge there, they attempted to move on to Canada. After traveling for four months and 1300 miles, the Indian band was caught by the federal troops and, far outnumbered, defeated badly at the eastern foot of the Bear Paw Mountains, just thirty miles from the Canadian border. Of the 650 who started the trip, close to 200 died, including women and children. Just before the official surrender, Chief Joseph sent the following message to the United States Commanding officer, General Howard:[2]

> [Chief Joseph laments the death of so many of his people by war, hunger, and cold. He claims he will "fight no more."]

Charles Erskine Wood, an aide to General Howard during the Nez Percé campaign, wrote:[3]

> [Wood claims that the U. S. Government never gave Joseph "one single act of justice."]

Another view was reported to have been expressed by General Sheridan: "The only good Indian is a dead Indian."

Chief Joseph died in 1904, sadly grieving the loss of his beloved country.

---

[2] Report of the Secretary of War, 1877, as quoted in Ralph K. Andrist, The Long Death, The Last Days of the Plains Indians (Macmillan Co., New York, 1964), 315.

[3] Ibid., 317.

3. The following selection was written by Albert H. Kneale, who served as an Indian agent in the western United States from 1899 to 1935:[4]

> [Kneale points out that when Custer was wiped out at the Little Big Horn, it became known as a "massacre." But when a Sioux encampment (a group of men, women, and children, not a war party) was wiped out by U. S. Cavalry it was not called a massacre. Kneale condemns the white man for his "bestial" actions toward the Indian.]

4. In 1947 Time ran an account of what has happened to one Indian tribe, the Navaho:[3]

> [The Time article describes how the U. S. Government, after giving the Navajo a reservation of three and one half million arid acres and helping them prosper, had decided in 1933 to order the Navajo to do away with their sheep. The result is that now, in 1947, the Navajo are faced with constant disease and the threat of starvation.]

5. Clarence Wesley, a former president of the Inter-Tribal Council of the National Congress of American Indians, analyzed the government's treatment of American Indians in an article entitled "An Indian Speaks Out":[6]

> [In his analysis, Wesley finds that the Federal Government has failed to solve the problems of the Indians. He argues that what Indians really need are the resources to organize themselves, free from bureaucratic interference.]

---

[4]Albert H. Kneale, Indian Agent (Caxton, Caldwell, Idaho, 1950), 188-190. (From INDIAN AGENT by Albert Kneale. Published by The Caxton Printers, Ltd., Caldwell, Idaho.)

[5]"Indians: Winter of Death," Time, November 3, 1947, 18. (Courtesy TIME: Copyright Time, Inc., 1947)

[6]Wesley Explains Real Indian Issues by Clarence Wesley, Pres. Inter-Tribal Council of the National Congress of American Indians, 1956.

B. The Negroes

The civil rights of Negroes is a vital domestic issue in this country today. The difficulties of the problem and the personal pain of all concerned cannot possibly be communicated in this unit, which merely attempts to raise a few questions in your mind about one fact of this problem: "Is the manner in which American democracy works likely to help solve this problem or is there something in the nature of American democracy which makes a solution extremely difficult, if not impossible?"

1. The following excerpt, drawn from Tocqueville's Democracy in America relates a conversation between Tocqueville and a Pennsylvanian:[7]

> I said one day to an inhabitant of Pennsylvania, "Be so good as to explain to me how it happens, that in a State founded by Quakers, and celebrated for its toleration, free Blacks are not allowed to exercise civil rights. They pay taxes; is it not fair that they should vote?"
>
> "You insult us," replied my informant, "if you imagine that our legislators could have committed so gross an act of injustice and intolerance."
>
> "Then the Blacks possess the right of voting in this country?"
>
> "Without doubt."
>
> "How comes it, then, that at the polling-booths this morning, I did not perceive a single Negro in the meeting?"
>
> "This is not the fault of the law: the Negroes have an undisputed right of voting; but they voluntarily abstain from making their appearance."
>
> "A very pretty piece of modesty on their part!" rejoined I.
>
> "Why, the truth is, that they are not disinclined to vote,

---

[7]Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, I, 333.

> but they are afraid of being maltreated; in this country, the law is sometimes unable to maintain its authority, without the support of the majority. But in this case, the majority entertains very strong prejudices against the Blacks, and the magistrates are unable to protect them in the exercising of their legal rights."
>
> "Then the majority claims the right not only of making the laws, but of breaking the laws it has made."

2. In July, 1863, draft riots erupted in New York City, sparked by the publication in the newspapers of the lists of new draftees for the Union Army during the Civil War. As it happened, these lists were heavy with Irish names. Following is an excerpt from the diary of George Templeton Strong, a New York business man who kept a detailed record of public events:[8]

> [Strong's diary is a record of the violence and destruction he witnessed in the riots. He characterizes the Irish as "rabble", "brutal, base, cruel, cowards" and condemns the mob's killing of Negroes as "unspeakable infamy."]

3. You may have read in the newspapers about riots led and carried out by Negroes in such places as the Harlem district of New York or the Watts district of Los Angeles. The previous selection reported a riot in 1863 in New York City started by Irish immigrants. The following article entitled "Cicero Nightmare" which appeared in the July 28, 1951 issue of The Nation describes another riot in quite a different kind of neighbor-

---

[8] Alan Nevins and M. Thomas, eds., The Diary of George Templeton Strong (Macmillan Co., New York, 1952), 335-337, 339-343. (Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company from DIARY OF GEORGE TEMPLETON STRONG by Alan Nevins and M. Thomas. Copyright 1952 by The Macmillan Company.)

hood, one led neither by Negroes nor by Irish immigrants:[9]

> [The article describes what happened when a twenty-nine year old Negro, Harvey E. Clark, Jr., tried to move into an apartment in all-white Cicero, a suburb of Chicago. The Cicero police, after first trying to prevent him from moving in, made no effort to control the angry mob that had gathered outside the apartment. In full view of the police, and later the National Guard, the mob smashed windows, destroyed Clark's furniture and tried to set fire to the building. Order was finally restored. Although the Chicago N.A.A.C.P. was demanding Federal prosecutions, the article concludes, "The war there might last longer than the war in Korea."]

4. In 1966, 13 years after the end of the Korean War and 15 years after the Cicero riot, not a single Negro had a home in Cicero. The following article describes the situation in Cicero as of September, 1966:[10]

> [The article describes how the "civic leaders of the Chicago area" agreed to the "demands" of Martin Luther King in order to avoid a "suicidal" civil rights march through Cicero. King was "denounced" by a "dissident group of Negroes" who threatened to march on Cicero, but King expressed satisfaction with the agreement.]

5. Senator Theodore J. Bilbo of Mississippi was the guest on a "Meet the Press" Conference in 1946. Following is a transcript of that radio program:[11]

> [During the course of the interview Senator Bilbo defends his racist views.]

---

[9]Homer A. Jack, "Cicero Nightmare," The Nation, July 28, 1951, 64-65.

[10]"Crossing the Red Sea," Time, September 2, 1966, 19. (Courtesy TIME, copyright Time, Inc., 1966).

[11]The American Mercury, November, 1946, 525-534.

6. On May 17, 1954 the Supreme Court of the United States in deciding the case of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka declared that segregating school children solely on the basis of race deprives the children of minority groups of equal educational opportunity. This signalled the end of the era in which a school system could provide separate but equal facilities for negroes and whites. In 1955 the Supreme Court declared that desegregation should proceed "with all deliberate speed" and that the process of desegregation should be carried out in a "systematic and effective" manner, within a "reasonable" time. The following chart indicates the extent of desegregation in 17 Southern states as of December, 1965, nearly 12 years after the Supreme Court decision:[12]

---

[12] Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1966 (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966), 123.

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS--SEGREGATION-DESEGRATION STATUS SOUTHERN STATES: 1957 TO 1965

/As of May except as indicated. . . . Desegregation refers to change in schools from segregated white and Negro status to biracial or multiracial status, either in practice or principle/

Date	School Districts		Enrollment (1,000)					Negro Students in Schools with White Students	
			Total			In desegregated districts			
	Total	With both white and Negro students	Desegregated	White	Negro	White	Negro	Number (1,000)	Percent of Negro enrollment
1957	9,697	3,695	683	9,124	2,798	[a]1,848	325	[b]110	(NA)
1958	8,514	2,903	758	9,428	2,924	[a]1,953	377	[a]132	(NA)
1959	7,874	2,875	740	9,651	3,008	[a]2,262	447	[a]146	(NA)
1960	7,016	2,851	755	10,004	3,057	[a]2,538	520	195	6.4
1961	6,663	2,839	783	10,184	3,097	[a]3,064	706	217	7.0
1962	6,370	3,047	913	10,406	3,250	[a]3,584	918	247	7.6
1963	6,198	3,054	980	10,656	3,328	4,717	1,097	265	8.0
1964	6,120	3,027	1,161	10,941	3,421	[a]5,356	1,484	316	9.2
1965	5,457	3,031	1,476	11,179	3,481	[a]6,704	1,939	380	10.9
1965 December	5,372	2,999	[c]4,804	11,573	3,573	(NA)	(NA)	568	15.9

NA Not available. a Excludes Missouri. b Excludes Missouri and West Virginia. n Number of school districts ruled "In compliance" with Federal regulations of U.S. Office of Education. Not all desegregated districts for 1965-66 school year were "In compliance."

7. Since 1954, Congress has passed numerous laws designed to guarantee equal rights for Negroes in such areas as voting, housing, transportation and other services. It has thus been claimed that progress has been made in achieving civil rights for Negroes. On August 22, 1966, Newsweek magazine published the results of a national survey of racial attitudes in America. Following is an article from that issue entitled "White Consensus: They're Trying to Go Too Fast":[13]

> [The article cites the results of a recent poll. The poll shows that whites, while agreeing that Negroes have been oppressed, now feel that the Negro is asking for too much, too soon. The poll also indicates that upper income whites are more sympathetic to demonstrations and have fewer stereotypes than low income whites.]

8. In the same issue Newsweek presented a chart, "How White Views of the Negro Have Changed":[14]

> [The chart compares white attituded toward Negroes in 1963 and 1966.]

9. Martin Luther King has probably received more recognition than any other leader in the civil rights movement. Following is an excerpt drawn from his book entitled Why We Can't Wait:[15]

---

[13]Newsweek, August 22, 1966, 24-26. (Copyright Newsweek, Inc., August, 1966.)

[14]Ibid., 26.

[15]Martin Luther King, Jr., Why We Can't Wait (Harper and Row, New York, 1963), 139, 148-169. (From pp. 139, 148-169, WHY WE CAN'T WAIT by Martin Luther King, Jr. Copyright © 1964 by Martin Luther King, Jr. Originally appeared in Life, and reprinted by permission of Harper & Row, Publishers.)

[In the excerpt, King rejects the belief that Negroes have everything they need. He argues, instead, that America owes the Negro an enormous debt that the government must begin to repay through a "massive program" of "special, compensatory measures."]

10. Josephine Baker, a famous Negro entertainer, gave a speech in St. Louis on February 3, 1952:[16]

[The speech relates how the discrimination and terror of St. Louis forced Josephine Baker to leave America and take up residence in Paris. But she could not forget St. Louis and even in moments of joy, such as the Paris celebration of Lindbergh's flight, she experienced the pain inflicted by her racist countrymen.]

C. The Japanese-Americans

Since the 1860's, Japanese had immigrated to the United States until they were excluded by the Immigration Act of 1924 as "aliens ineligible to citizenship." In 1940 there were about 127,000 people of Japanese descent living in the United States. In 1941 the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and war was declared.

1. The following article by a Japanese-American describes how the united States government treated Japanese-Americans in the months directly after Pearl Harbor:[17]

---

[16]Josephine Baker, "Remember St. Louis," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 7, 1952.

[17]Yoshiko Uchida, "Evacuation: The First Five Months," California Monthly, November, 1966, 5-8.

[The article describes the shock of the Japanese-Americans on the West Coast upon learning of the Pearl Harbor attack. Their shock soon gave way to the fear that they would be condemned for the attack. Such was the case, and in the interests of national security, all citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry were sent to detention camps in the early months of 1942. The author expresses her shock and disbelief over these events.]

2. Differing views were expressed about the evacuation of the Japanese from the West Coast in World War II.[18]

General DeWitt, Commanding General of the Western Defense Command said:

[The general states "A Jap's a Jap" and that "they" were a "dangerous element" on the West Coast.]

Robert E. Cushman stated:

[There were no cases of "espionage, sabotage, or other disloyal conduct" by any Japanese-American in the U.S. or Hawaii during the war.]

D. The Chinese-Americans

With the discovery of gold in California in 1848, labor became scarce and Chinese immigrants were welcomed. In 1868 the Burlingame Treaty gave the Chinese an official right to immigrate to the United States, but with the completion of the transcontinental railways in 1869 white laborers flowed into the West. In 1871 it was said that there were three men for every job. In that same year 21 Chinese were killed in a San Francisco riot, and the same number were hung or shot in Los Angeles. Letters pleading for help were sent to Washington by Chinese-American leaders. Congress made an investigation of the anti-Chinese attitudes in the West in 1875.

---

[18]"Civil Liberties in the Atomic Age," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, January, 1947, 57.

1. A popular slogan of the time was "The Chinese Must Go." Merchants and saloon-keepers headed advertisements, "Our Motto: The Chinese Must Go." One bill in the California Constitutional Convention was worded simply: "Resolved: The Chinese Must Go."

The rising tide of opinion for excluding the Chinese from the United States was lead by Dennis Kearny, president of the Workingmen's Party. A brief selection from their manifesto follows:[19]

> To an American death is preferable to life on a par with the Chinaman. What then is left to us? Our votes! . . . But this may fail. Congress, as you have seen, has often been manipulated by thieves, speculators, land grabbers, bloated bond-holders, railroad magnates, and shoddy aristocrats--a golden lobby dictating its proceedings. Our own legislature is little better. . . . We declare to them that when the workingmen have shown their will that "John"[20] should leave our shores, and that will shall be thwarted by fraud or cash, by bribery and corruption, it will be right for them to take their own affairs into their own hands and meet fraud with force. . . . Treason is better than to labor beside a Chinese slave. . . . The people are about to take their own affairs into their own hands and they will not be stayed either by 'Citizen Vigilantes,' state militia, nor United States Troops.

2. A former United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization in the New York District, Edward Corsi, himself an Italian immigrant, wrote the following in 1935:[21]

> [Mr. Corsi states that imported coolies are not only an economic threat (they work for low wages) but a "menace to American institutions." He expresses the belief that assimilation is impossible and he cites Kipling's "East is East and West is West."]

---

[19] Manifesto of the Workingmen's Party, October 16, 1876.

[20] "John" was a nickname for the Chinese at this time.

[21] Edward Corsi, In the Shadow of Liberty (Macmillan, New York, 1935), 159-160, 176.

3. During the riots of July, 1877, in San Francisco, twenty-five Chinese laundries were burned, and numerous Chinese killed. It was generally agreed that Chinese were not safe on the streets.

On May 6, 1882 Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act. Following is an excerpt from this Act:[22]

> An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese.
>
> Whereas, in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof; Therefore
>
> Be it enacted, That from and after the expiration of ninety days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of ten years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be . . . suspended; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come, or, having so come after the expiration of ninety days, to remain within the United States. . . .
>
> Sec. 6. . . . every Chinese person other than a laborer who may be entitled by said treaty and this act to come within the United States, shall be identified as so entitled by the Chinese Government in each case, . . . such person is entitled conformably to the treaty in this act mentioned to come within the United States. . . .
>
> Sec. 15. That the words "Chinese laborer" whenever used in this act, shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining.

This act was renewed in 1892, and Chinese immigration was suspended indefinitely in 1902. In 1943 Chinese immigration was permitted within the strict limits of the quota system, which meant that 105 Chinese a year were allowed to immigrate to the United States.

---

[22] U. S. Statutes at Large, XXII, 58.

SECTION VI

MINORITY OPINION: THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE UNPOPULAR CAUSE

All of us at one time or another find ourselves holding opinions differing from those held by the majority around us. Some people find this sufficient cause for changing their opinions. Others are convinced that they are right and do everything in their power to convince the majority of this. Before reading the following selections, it might be valuable to review Tocqueville's statement in Section II.

A. The Abolitionist

Elijah P. Lovejoy was a Presbyterian minister who became active in the anti-slavery movement during the 1830's. He set up his headquarters in Alton, Illinois in southwestern Illinois, just across the Mississippi River from Missouri. He published his abolitionist views in a newspaper called "The Observer." Lovejoy's printing press had been destroyed twice and had been thrown in the river before the incident described in the following article which appeared in the Alton Spectator:[1]

RIOT AT ALTON, ILLINOIS.

From the Alton Spectator of the 9th inst.

[This selection relates an eyewitness account, by the Mayor of Alton, of how a mob forced their way into a warehouse to destroy Lovejoy's printing press.]

B. The Atheist

Although Americans today generally believe in freedom of religion, most also believe that people should have some religious faith. The woman

---

[1]As reprinted in Human Right, New York (December, 1837), III, 6.

described in the following article, however, felt differently about religion and religious institutions. As an atheist, she did not believe in God.[2]

> [The Time article has a brief sketch of Mrs. Madalyn Murray and her successful court fight to have the Supreme Court ban prayers in public schools. Mrs. Murray is now trying to get the courts to rule on the constitutionality of the tax-exempt status of churches and church-owned businesses.]

C. The Nazi

The following article describes the activities of George Lincoln Rockwell, the leader of the American Nazi Party, a group subscribing to the ideas of Adolf Hitler, the fascist leader of Germany from the early 1930's until the end of World War II in Europe:[3]

> [The 1967 Esquire article describes the origin, growth, and ideas of Rockwell's American Nazi Party. The Party's program, being genocide for Jews and despotism for Negroes, has been largely unsuccessful. Rockwell and his followers have been, on occasion, subjected to questionable and even unconstitutional decisions by the authorities.]

D. The First Amendment

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States was ratified in 1791 and has since been "the law of the land." It reads:

---

[2]"The Woman Who Hates Churches," Time, May 15, 1964, 53-54. (Courtesy TIME: copyright Time, Inc., 1964).

[3]Fred C. Shapiro, "The Last Word (We Hope) on George Lincoln Rockwell," Esquire, February, 1967, 101, 103-105. (Reprinted by permission of John Cushman Associates, Inc.)

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

SECTION VII

SOCIETY AND PREJUDICE

Psychologist Gordon Allport makes an interesting analysis of the growth of prejudice in his book The Nature of Prejudice:[1]

> [Allport states that "prejudiced personalities" are more numerous when certain conditions, which he describes, are present in society.]

2. The scientist tries to explain reality to us. The poet expresses hope for a new reality. The following poem by Denis A. McCarthy was reprinted in Constantine Paurenzio's book, The Soul of An Immigrant:[2]

> [The poem states that respect, toleration, and freedom are the characteristics of America and "this is the land where hate should die."]

3. The following speech was given by Judge Learned Hand, an eminent judge of the United States Circuit Court, at an "I am an American Day" ceremony held in Central Park, New York in 1944:[3]

> [Judge Hand, in arguing that Americans are a "picked group" because they chose to come here, states that liberty can only be defended in the "hearts" of people. This "spirit of liberty" manifests itself in toleration and this is what World War II is being fought for.]

---

[1] Gordon Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, 221, 240.

[2] Constantine M. Paurenzio, The Soul of an Immigrant (Macmillan, New York, 1921), 202.

[3] Learned Hand, The Spirit of Liberty (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1952), 189-191.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

There are numerous books on minorities and prejudices in America, but many are very technical and difficult reading. Therefore, only the classic works in this field and some of the easier reading books will be mentioned here.

The classic study of prejudice is Gordon Allport's *The Nature of Prejudice* (Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, Mass., 1954).* This is quite technical reading, and the bibliography in Allport's book is excellent.

The best analyses of American democracy have often been written by foreigners. Henry Steele Commager's *America in Perspective, The United States Through Foreign Eyes* (New American Library, New York, 1962)* is an anthology which presents in abbreviated form most of the standard works on American society written by foreign observers. Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* (John Allyn, Boston, 1876)* is readily available in most book stores in paperback edition.

James Bryce's *The American Commonwealth* (G. P. Putnam, New York, 1964)* and his shorter *Reflections on American Institutions* (Pocketbooks, Inc., New York, 1961)* are highly respected books. Two American authors who take a most critical view of this aspect of the American scene are James Fenimore Cooper, especially in *The American Democrat* (H. E. Phinney, Cooperstown, New York, 1838), and H. L. Mencken.

The outstanding work on the problem of freedom and authority in Puritan New England is E. S. Morgan's *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop* (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1958).*

The point of view of the Quakers and Mormons can be gained by reading *The Quaker Reader* edited by Jessamyn West (Viking, New York, 1962)

and Among the Mormons, edited by William Mulder and A. Russell Mortensen (Knopf, New York, 1958). A very readable history of the Mormons is Thomas O'Dea's The Mormons (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964).*

There are numerous books on the American Jews such as Nathan Glazer's American Judaism (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964).* Certain novels are perhaps the most revealing, two among many being Michael Gold's Jews Without Money (Liverright, New York, 1930) and Philip Roth's Goodbye Columbus (Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1959). One of the most important books on religion in the United States is Will Herberg's Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology (Doubleday, New York, 1960).*

All of Oscar Handlin's books are excellent for understanding the history and problems of American immigrants. Two of his best are The Uprooted (Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1951)* and The Newcomers (Doubleday, New York, 1962). The latter focuses on the experiences of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York City. Marcus Lee Hansen's book The Immigrant in American History (Harper & Row, New York, 1964)* is concerned with many of the questions examined in this unit, as is John Higham's Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1925 (Antheneum, New York, 1963).*

Books on Negroes are innumerable and only the most readable are mentioned here. Martin Luther King's Why We Can't Wait (New American Library, New York, 1964),* Richard Wright's Black Boy (New American Library, New York, 1963),* and the writings of James Baldwin and Dick Gregory present the problem from the point of view of the Negro. Griffin's book is by a white man who travelled through the South disguised as a Negro. Robert Penn Warren's Segregation (Random House, New York, 1957)*

gives you candid views from the common people involved in the transition from segregation to integration. Two of the classic studies of the Negro problem are: Gunnar Myrdal's An American Dilemma, which is condensed in Arnold Rose's The Negro in America (Beacon, Boston, 1951),* and Charles Silberman's Crisis in Black and White (Random House, New York, 1964).*

Helen Hunt Jackson's A Century of Dishonor: The Early Crusade in Indian Reform (Harper and Row, New York, 1965)* is the classic work on the treatment of American Indians. William Brandon's American Heritage Book of Indians (Dell, New York, 1964)* is colorful and easy reading. Ralph K. Andrist's The Long Death, The Last Days of the Plains Indians (Macmillan, New York, 1964) and Jack D. Forbes' The Indians in America's Past (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1964) dramatize the problems of Indian-white relations.

Carry McWilliams' Brothers Under the Skin (Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1964)* covers in a comprehensive way all the problems raised in this unit, and his clear point of view is that the problem stems from class distinctions rather than from differences in race and culture.

---

*Available in paperback edition.